



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,506	10/17/2003	Rangarajan Sundar	P957 US	2003

28390	7590	01/31/2008
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.		
IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT		
3576 UNOCAL PLACE		
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403		

EXAMINER	
PRONE, CHRISTOPHER D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3738	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/31/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.vasciplegal@medtronic.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,506

Applicant(s)

SUNDAR, RANGARAJAN

Examiner

Christopher D. Prone

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 and 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 and 23-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Buirge fails to disclose that the stent is retained by solely by the end of the detachable portion and that a modification of Buirge's mandrel would destroy the reference. This is not convincing because the applicants disclose background describing how cones are already known and used to support ends for coating the stents. The cones would only used for supporting the ends during the coating process as taught by the current disclosure, not for forming the entire stent understructure. The combination simply uses the teaching from the current disclosure that a coating may be applied and cones may be used to support only the ends, which will all the main structure to still be constructed without failure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-20 and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buirge (5,735,897) in view of admissions in the present specification. Buirge discloses a stent delivery system comprising: catheter; balloon operably attached to

the catheter; and stent disposed on the balloon (col. 2, lines 37-38); coating disposed on the stent, the coating applied to a preliminary stent comprising a permanent portion and a detachable portion while retaining the preliminary stent by the detachable portion, the stent formed from the permanent portion by removing the detachable portion. In column 4, lines 32-52, Buirge disclose that "a long tube of stent- pump is prepared and then individual stents are cut off." If one considers the long tube, or preliminary stent, capable of forming, for example, three stents, then the first and third stents can be considered the first and second detachable portions respectively as claimed and the second, or middle stent, can be considered the permanent portion. The ends are finished with additional coating (col. 4, lines 50-52). The mandrel is the retainer, with the portions that hold the outer detachable stents first and second retaining portions.

However, Buirge does not disclose the detachable portion having a pooled coating or the use of supporting end cones. The background of the present specification states:

"When the coating is applied, the stent is generally supported on a fixture, such as a mandrel or similar device that allows the stent to be immersed in or sprayed with the coating material. The stent is retained on the fixture to prevent the stent from sliding. Cones aligned with the long axis and inserted in the ends of the stent, supporting pins, or clips can be used to retain the stent. Possible retainer materials that can be used to reduce liquid adhesion to the retainer include Delrin, Teflon, or stainless steel."

The stents of Buirge are made on a mandrel, but it is well known as admitted by the applicant to use cones, supporting pins or clips which the applicant further admits leads to pooling on the detachable portions.

Regarding claims 10-11, Buirge discloses a stent delivery system, which comprises a stent made by detaching ends of the stent by cutting. However, Buirge does not disclose exactly how the detachable ends are cut off. The use of lasers or mechanical cutting devices is well known to ones of ordinary skill in the art for cutting and making stents.

Regarding claims 10-11, Buirge discloses a stent delivery system, which comprises a coated stent. However, Buirge does not disclose applying the coating by spraying. Spraying or dipping of stents to apply coatings is well known to ones of ordinary skill in the art as obvious equivalents, often cited together as alternative methods, e.g. in Hossainy et al. (6,153,252- col. 1, lines 25-27) and Harry (2002/00:38146- paragraph [0038]).

Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buirge (5,735,897) as above in view Wang (6,379,379B1). Buirge discloses a stent delivery system as above. However, Buirge does not disclose the ends as polished. Wang teaches a stent having polished ends (col. 9, lines 1-10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the polished ends of the stent, as taught by Wang, to the stent as per Buirge, so that "the edges are rounded or smoothed out so that the possibility of damage to a passage is lessened" as cited by Wang.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Prone whose telephone number is (571) 272-6085. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fri 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/688,506
Art Unit: 3738

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher D Prone
Examiner
Art Unit 3738


CDP


CORRINE McDERMOTT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700